PTO/SB/21 (02-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

1	TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Application Number	09/712,780				
耳				Filing Date	Novembe	November 13, 2000			
				First Named Inventor	Purnam Sheth, et al.				
				Art Unit	2155 David Lazaro				
				Examiner Name					
1	Total Number of Pages in This Submission 2			Attorney Docket Number	CISCO-3	095			
	ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)								
	Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to Group				
	Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
	Amendment / Reply		Petition		Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)				
	After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information				
	Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter				
	Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):				
	Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			plicant/Attorney Interview mmary; return postcard			
	Information Disclosure Statement			*					
	Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks						
	Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application								
ć	Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1,52 or 1.53								
-	SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT								
	Firm Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626 or Individual name THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP								
	Signature	Marthuis							
	Date June 30, 2004								
		С	ERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Pos Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 14: Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.									
	Typed or printed name	Typed or printed name Sharon E. Bya		ım		**			
	Signature	Sho	un	2 13m	Date	June 30, 2004			

This collection of Information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: <u>09/712,780</u>	First Named A	applicant: Purnam	Sheth et al.						
Examiner: <u>David Lazaro</u>	Art Unit: 2155	Status of Applica	Status of Application: Pending						
Participants: (1) Examiner David	Lazaro	(2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626							
(3)	(4)		 						
Date of Interview: June 30, 2004	Time: 11:00 a.m.								
Type of Interview: (a) [X] Telephonic	(b) [] Personal	,,,,,	(c) [] Video Conference						
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description:									
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed					
(1) Rej. 1, 8, 15, 22 (2) (3)			[X] [] []	[]					
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)									
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:									
Problems with claim language relating to the term "service" were discussed. Agreement was reached as to replacement claim language. Applicant agreed to Examiner's amendment.									
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.									
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)									
(Applicant's Representative Signature) (Docket No. CISCO-309)									